

**AREA PLAN COMMISSION OF TIPPECANOE COUNTY
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING**

DATE.....June 17, 2004
TIME.....4:45 P.M.
PLACE.....COUNTY
OFFICE BLDG.
20 N. 3RD STREET
LAFAYETTE IN 47901

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	NON-VOTING	STAFF PRESENT
Robert Bowman	Mark Hermodson		Sallie Fahey
Dr. Carl Griffin	David Williams		Margy Deverall
Gary Schroeder	Steve Schreckengast		Jay Seeger, Atty
KD Benson			

KD Benson called the meeting to order.

I. APPROVAL THE MINUTES

Carl Griffin moved to approve the minutes of the June 2, 2004 meeting. Gary Schroeder seconded and the motion carried voice vote.

II. UPDATE FROM DEVELOPER/STAFF WORKING GROUP: RESIDENTIAL ZONES

Sallie Fahey explained that initially this topic was on the agenda in order determine whether R2 or R3 would be the next topic. She stated that both of those topics were going to be on hold while the work group revisited the R1 topic. She suggested that Dave Buck, from the City of West Lafayette, make a presentation on what should be looked at in R1. She mentioned some of the concerns that needed to be addressed include: how the Clean Water Act work is affected the changes in R1; how window wells were affected by a 5' setback.

KD Benson said that parts of the houses that were connected or underground were previously discussed.

Sallie Fahey agreed. She explained that the way the proposal is currently written, there can be a 1' intrusion into the 5' setback.

David Buck, City of West Lafayette Engineer, stated that his concerns were that if a change in the pervious area was allowed, how would that affect the new requirements of Phase 2 of the Clean Water Act. He explained that it was unclear whether to use the set release runoff rate or what is currently in the Phase 2 document. He pointed out that changing 2 variables at the same time, might create a different result than what is anticipated. He stated that there have been complaints from contractors that with a 5' setback there is not enough room for both houses to have either a basement egress window or a 2' chimney offset. He mentioned that it is also a fire safety concern to have the houses that close together.

KD Benson asked if he was involved in drainage.

David Buck stated that he has done drainage work in the past. He asked if the County Surveyor had bee involved in these work sessions. He explained that he knew a little bit about the Phase 2 program, but the surveyors have been more involved and have a background in storm water design.

KD Benson stated that it should be reviewed with Dave Eikenberry, the Drainage Board Engineer.

David Buck stated that Phase 2 would be implemented by January 1, 2005, which is within 6 months of the new Drainage ordinance. He said that this is something that should be maintained as unified.

KD Benson asked if William Davis wanted to make any comments on this topic.

William Davis, TBird Design, 4720 South 100 West, Lafayette, IN, stated that hopefully it would be a one meeting issue. He said that there was a committee being formed to answer some of these questions, which included, Opal Kuhl, Mike Spencer, David Buck and Steve Murray. He stated that he did not know the status of that committee, but suggested that David Eikenberry be a part of it.

KD Benson asked if the workgroup was made up of all developers.

Sallie Fahey stated that it was made up of both developers and surveyors. She said that she would contact Steve Murray about participating in this issue and ask him to also involve David Eikenberry.

William Davis stated that David Eikenberry should review this issue because it related to detention storage only. He mentioned that it was not a release issue or a water quality issue.

Sallie Fahey stated that once Steve Murray has obtained an answer from David Eikenberry, then the workgroup would meet with David Buck, Opal Kuhl, Mike Spencer and Steve Murray to discuss it.

KD Benson asked if the workgroup and staff could work out the window well and chimney issues.

Sallie Fahey stated that those issues could be worked out while they were awaiting a response from David Eikenberry.

KD Benson asked what the next topic would be after the R1 issue was resolved.

Sallie Fahey stated that they were going to let the developers pick which topic was next.

William Davis stated that they would like to review the R2 districts next.

III. ALLOWING NBU IN UNINCORPORATED TOWNS

Kathy Lind stated that this was a topic that the staff had been discussing and wanted the Ordinance Committee's opinion on whether to continue with it. She said that this was not a formal proposal at this time. She read from the memo and recapped the purpose of the NBU zone. She explained that the question is whether an NBU zone would have a positive or negative impact in unincorporated towns with storefronts without sewer systems. She recapped the pros and cons of this option from the memo. She referenced the diagram on the back of the memo, which showed that the existing buildings complied with the NBU district standards and not with the current zone of NB. She mentioned that she spoke with Ron Noles of the Health Department regarding the cons of this issue listed on the memo. She explained that the Health Department looks at businesses in the small towns on a case-by-case basis. She stated that according to the Health Department, a restaurant would not be permitted in the small towns because the water usage would not work on a small lot with a septic system. She mentioned that the Pizza King in Americus was an exception because a dye test was done on its septic system and no dye surfaced.

Sallie Fahey stated that when the UZO was being drafted, the unincorporated towns were excluded because they did not have sanitary sewer. She explained that because NBU allowed more lot coverage and smaller lots the concern was that NBU should be for urban and sewered areas. She pointed out that the more rezoning cases that they see in the small towns the more they realize that NBU is a good fit, if it were not for the septic problems. She stated that NBU would offer some incentive for small business in these areas that are in need of revitalization.

She said that the question is whether the suitability of septic systems can be balanced with the revitalization of small towns and allow for a UZO amendment that would protect both.

Carl Griffin pointed out that if the small towns were revitalized enough, then it would not be long before a restaurant was appropriate.

Sallie Fahey pointed out that if it were a new establishment, a couple of the small lots might have to be combined in order to satisfy the septic need. She mentioned that if that occurred, then it might need to be replatted and thus eliminate the need for NBU, except in the design. She stated that the NBU design puts the building, on the sidewalk with parking in back, was better suited for a small town than the suburban design with acres of parking in front.

KD Benson pointed out that a small hardware store in a small town would not have a lot of water use or put a strain on the septic system. She stated that she liked the idea of NBU in the small towns.

Sallie Fahey stated that the staff liked the idea too, but was concerned about the septic systems.

Jay Seeger pointed out that an NBU establishment would still need to meet the septic requirements through the Health Department.

Kathy Lind said that even in an NB or GB zone, septic system requirements would have to be met.

Sallie Fahey said that if a new establishment moved into an old building with an old septic, they would probably allow them to reuse the facilities and wait and see if there was a problem.

Robert Bowman stated that one of the reasons there was deterioration in small towns is because they are restricted on what they can do. He pointed out that if a septic system sits idle for a long period of time, it might not be able to be reused.

KD Benson pointed out that every one of the towns mentioned in the memo have septic problems.

Kathy Lind mentioned that Stockwell and Romney are going to be converted eventually.

KD Benson stated that brings up the sewerred, unincorporated areas for NBU.

Sallie Fahey stated that a sewerred area should be an automatic O.K. for NBU.

Robert Bowman stated that he does not have a problem with this idea, and any exceptions should be handled on a case-by-case basis.

Ron Highland mentioned that there are other restraints as well. He agreed that if these buildings were to be destroyed and not allowed to rebuild, it would be a huge waste. He stated that some of the property owners have let the buildings remain vacant because they don't have many options. He said that if the property owners had avenues with some safeguards, then things would start to happen. He stated that if someone wanted to change the use of a building to a restaurant, it automatically has to go through the State as well as additional requirements that would help legitimize and further protect that building. He explained that before they could get a permit, they would have to go through the State in order to change the use as per the Building Code.

Carl Griffin asked that if there were a change in use, but the new use was allowed under the current zoning, would the State have to grant the permits.

Ron Highland explained that he was referring to the use of the building itself and if the use were changed, the State would have to approve it as well as his office.

Carl Griffin asked if the reason it had to go to the State was because it was unincorporated.

Ron Highland replied negatively. He said that it was the Building Code rules.

KD Benson stated that this was according to State Building Codes.

Jay Seeger stated if nothing was done with the building, it would not have to go to the State.

KD Benson asked if there was a consensus to move forward with this idea.

Gary Schroeder stated that he thought this was a good idea to pursue, but wondered where this fell in the list of priorities.

Kathy Lind stated that this was something that she could work on.

Sallie Fahey stated that a couple of issues could be handled at one time. She said that the staff would work with the Health Department on this issue and bring a proposal to the Ordinance Committee.

IV. CHANGING FINAL DETAILED PLANS (FDP) FILING DEADLINE

Sallie Fahey explained that there are two types of planned developments, which both require approval of final detail plans, but the two sections of the ordinance do not match each other nor have a filing deadline. She stated that it is a problem for the staff to attempt to get the plans reviewed and a report written before a meeting. She recapped the condo-conversion final detail plan section and pointed out that not only is there no deadline, but it stated that the staff has to review the plans in 5 working days. She explained that not only is that hard to accomplish in 5 working days, but becomes even more difficult when the plans are turned in piece by piece. She stated that they would like to clarify this section, so that if they have to be reviewed in 5 working days, it is based on a complete submission. She stated that the normal planned development final detail plans do not have any deadlines at all. She said that for a number of years, they have been informally asking petitioners to turn them in a week ahead of time. She explained that even turning in the plans one week before the meeting still only leaves a one-half of a day to prepare a staff report before the packet goes out. She gave the example of one meeting where there were 6-7 final detail plans on the agenda and plans were still being received and staff reports written a half hour before the meeting began. She stressed how chaotic this process can be. She suggested a deadline of two weeks prior to any given meeting for full submission of final detail plans. She pointed out that a two week deadline would give the staff one week to review all materials and write a staff report in time for the Thursday packet.

Carl Griffin stated that he thought that made sense.

Gary Schroeder asked if there were any comments from the developers or audience.

Tim Beyer, Vester and Associates, 309 Columbia Street, Suite 101, Lafayette, IN, stated that he could understand the problem that staff was having. He pointed out that there are other issues in the planned development process that the developers had requested for review. He suggested that the issue of final detail plan deadlines be considered with the other planned development issues as a whole. He mentioned that two weeks does not sound like a lot of time, but it is when there are construction workers standing by waiting for the PD plans to be recorded.

Sallie Fahey stated that she could agree with that, but the difference is whether the two weeks comes out of the surveyors' time or staff's time.

KD Benson asked if there were a lot of PD issues that came out of the efficiency meetings.

Sallie Fahey stated that the PD issues that were brought up during the efficiency meetings dealt with whether or not they could get a rezone based on a concept rather than a plan. She

mentioned that there was not a lot of support for that suggestion, but the Committee decided that they would consider it at a later date.

Tim Beyer stated that one of the other issues concerned both PDs and subdivisions. He said that the other issue was where the Drainage Board and Highway Department had already approved the project and they wanted to be able to start construction.

KD Benson asked if he was referring to starting construction before the rezone.

Tim Beyer replied negatively.

Sallie Fahey explained that they were interested in starting construction, before the construction plans were approved. She stated that it is up the APC to approve construction plans and the APC relies on the other agencies to review them. She pointed out that the other agencies are only reviewing them, and advising the staff, and not approving the plans. She stated that she would be happy to discuss this possibility, but did not think there was much room to change this issue.

Carl Griffin asked if there was a middle ground that could be reached.

Sallie Fahey stated that an example of one compromise would be if the cities advised that the sewer and water plans were ready to be approved, but were waiting for the Drainage Board and Highway Department reviews, developers could submit construction plans for just sewer and water and that work could be started following APC approval. She explained that portions could be separated and approved one at a time so construction could be started.

KD Benson asked if there was a middle ground that could be reached on the FDP deadline issue.

Tim Beyer stated that if the City has signed off on the plans and the contractor is permitted to start on certain portions that would probably satisfy the requests of the developers.

Sallie Fahey asked if he was referring to PD filing deadlines or construction plan approvals.

Tim Beyer mentioned that Sallie Fahey had stated earlier that in the past the staff has told developers they could start construction on certain sections.

Sallie Fahey clarified that the staff has approved plans for parts of the construction, one by one. She stressed that nobody has ever said that they could just go ahead and start work without the approval.

KD Benson asked for clarification that once approval for the roads has been given, they could start moving dirt, even if the final construction plans have not been received yet.

Sallie Fahey replied affirmatively.

KD Benson stated that the next question is the two-week deadline for FDP.

Tim Beyer stated that he did not have a concern with the deadline for FDP.

Sallie Fahey explained that a two-week deadline would give the staff a week to review the plans and write a report, in time for the packet, which goes out one week before the meeting.

KD Benson stated that she liked the staff reports in the packet. She said that she really dislikes walking into a meeting and having brand new information that she has not had a chance to review.

Carl Griffin agreed that the Commissioners need to have time to review all-important information.

Several members agreed.

Sallie Fahey stressed how chaotic the one meeting was when the reports were written one half hour before the meeting. She pointed out that she did not even have a chance to review the reports before she had to present them to the Commission.

KD Benson suggested trying the two-week deadline and if it does not work, trying a 10-day deadline.

Sallie Fahey suggested trying the two-week deadline and allowing for changes and/or additions up to the 10-day deadline. She said that everything would have to be complete by the 10 –day deadline.

Tim Beyer stated that if some flexibility was allowed in that 2-week deadline, such as letters of credit, that would be satisfactory.

Sallie Fahey agreed that there could be some flexibility up until the 10-day cut off so long as there were no changes to the drawings. She stated that when Margy Deverall returned from vacation she would arrange a work group meeting and come up with a proposal.

Ron Highland asked if at the initial road approval stage, if the soil and erosion control was done at the same time, that would allow the road to be started.

Sallie Fahey stated that these days nothing can be started without soil and erosion control approval.

Ron Highland stated that soil and erosion control are automatic on most projects, but was unsure if it was part of the approval process being discussed.

Sallie Fahey stated that it is a requirement. She said that if they were separating parts of construction plans, they would need that approval first.

Carl Griffin asked about the process of adopting this proposal.

Sallie Fahey stated that the staff would work on this and bring a formal proposal to the Ordinance Committee for a vote.

V. SELLING PRIVATELY OWNED VEHICLES FROM RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY

Jay Seeger stated that the purpose of this proposal was to allow a resident to sell their car from their home. He explained that right now that was a prohibited use, and this proposed amendment would change that. He pointed out that this proposal would limit a resident to selling 2 vehicles of one ton or less or an RV that has been owned by the seller for at least one year. He said this would help control the residents who put 2 or 3 cars in their yard. He said that this would not address the selling of cars on the internet, but would control residents who are stockpiling cars that are not registered.

Carl Griffin asked how someone would interpret this proposal as applying to a licensed vehicle.

Jay Seeger stated that this refers to a vehicle that is registered, which means it is licensed.

Sallie Fahey asked if registration was different than being titled.

Al Levy stated that registration was different from being titled, but not different than being licensed.

Sallie Fahey asked if being registered meant it had a license plate.

Al Levy replied affirmatively. He said that a vehicle has to be titled to a person in order to get a registration and plate.

Carl Griffin asked if it was currently illegal to place a for sale sign on a car that is at a residence.

Jay Seeger stated that was correct. He explained that selling a car was not permitted in any zone other than NB or GB.

Al Levy stated that the City of Lafayette has it's own ordinance and this proposal would just apply to areas in the County.

Carl Griffin asked about the possibility of a resident buying 11 cars and then wanting to sell them.

Jay Seeger stated that this proposal was not going to affect the isolated car sale. He explained that if someone has owned a car for 3 months and decides to sell it from their yard, it would only be addressed if there were a complaint. He said that this would address the complaints that someone was always selling a car, and selling a different one every week.

Al Levy gave an example of a car for sale that has been sitting there for a long time, and then all of a sudden it is a different car. He stated that in that circumstance, he would investigate the situation.

Robert Bowman mentioned a residence on SR 38 that always has a different car for sale.

KD Benson stated that this would also prevent the one house in a neighborhood that has a great location, from getting everyone's car in his or her yard.

Robert Bowman stated that the person selling cars on the internet should not be allowed to park them in the yard for a month or two.

Al Levy stated that example was a violation because that person has probably become a car dealer.

Jay Seeger stated that this proposal does not give permission for a resident to sell on the internet.

Robert Bowman mentioned that he has received a complaint about a Dayton resident who is selling cars on the internet and leaving them in the yard.

Al Levy stated that he should file a formal complaint, so that it can be addressed.

Ron Highland posed the question of cars that are stockpiled in an enclosed building, where they could not be seen, and then sold on the internet.

Al Levy stated that in that circumstance, the seller is still a car dealer and in violation, unless the seller owns them all, registered to the seller, and owned by the seller for at least one year.

Jay Seeger stated that if the cars were enclosed and the seller owns them all, we are probably not going to receive a complaint.

Gary Schroeder asked for clarification that this would only apply to the County and not the Cities.

Al Levy explained that this would cover the entire County. He stated that the phrase "except where otherwise prohibited" meant that some areas, like the City of Lafayette, have additional ordinances that would put further restrictions on this issue.

Gary Schroeder asked about farm equipment.

Al Levy stated that farm equipment was not registered and not a problem, unless it was over a ton.

Gary Schroeder asked about boats and trailers.

Al Levy stated that boats and trailers were not licensed motor vehicles and not a problem.

Sallie Fahey stated that the proposal does not say “motor” vehicles.

Al Levy stated that a family vehicle was defined as a motor vehicle.

Jay Seeger stated that “motor” was taken out.

Al Levy stated that it was still in his copy.

Sallie Fahey stated that it was not in her copy, or the copies that were passed out.

Al Levy stated that they were talking about licensed trailers.

Sallie Fahey mentioned that it does refer to a hauling capacity and a boat can’t haul, but a trailer can.

KD Benson stated that a trailer couldn’t haul without an engine.

Jay Seeger stated that “motor” should be in the definition.

Sallie Fahey stated that they would have to come up with a footnote number.

Al Levy stated that the next number in sequence should be used.

KD Benson asked if the Ordinance Committee could pass this on to the full Commission, with the condition that the proper footnote be attached.

Sallie Fahey replied affirmatively. She asked if this footnote could be added to more than just SIC 55, because in the future it might be difficult to find. She said that she would also like to add it to some of the dwelling unit uses.

KD Benson asked what she meant by having a hard time finding it.

Sallie Fahey explained that staff would have to remember that all the information on family vehicles is found under Automotive Dealers and Gasoline Service Stations.

Al Levy pointed out that is where the question would arise if someone were selling an automobile.

Sallie Fahey said that they would probably be focusing on the residence rather than a business.

Al Levy stated that he would be looking for it under automotive, not under houses.

Kathy Lind stated that she agreed with Al Levy.

Sallie Fahey stated that her point was that it could be in more than one place. She pointed out that the question that staff would receive would be if someone could sell their car from their home.

Al Levy pointed out that if someone wanted to sell his or her son’s car, the son would have to reside in the house because the proposal states that it can be sold “on property on which the vehicle’s owner resides.” He stated that it has to be on the property of whomever the vehicle is registered to.

Gary Schroeder asked for clarification that this is currently not allowed and this proposal would just legitimize people selling their cars. He asked if a farmer could legally sell his farm equipment.

Al Levy replied affirmatively. He explained that the reason for this proposal is not just because selling cars is prohibited, but also because this has become a problem. He stated that this started with a car salesman who wanted to moonlight off of the dealership grounds. He reiterated that farm equipment has never been a problem.

Sallie Fahey stated that she was still confused on boats and trailers because they are not in this definition.

Al Levy stated that now that "motor" is included in the definition, it does not apply to trailers and the boat's motor does not count.

Sallie Fahey asked that since boats and trailers were not included, if they were prohibited from being sold at a residence.

Al Levy stated that is where the yard sale factor enters in.

Jay Seeger stated that even though they are not family vehicles, this proposal is permitting otherwise unlawful sales by allowing the sale of a family vehicle. He explained that right now a boat or trailer cannot be put in a yard with a for sale sign.

Al Levy stated that this proposal would have no affect on boats or trailers and the rule on those would stay the same, regardless of whether this passes or not. He reiterated that this is where the yard sale rule enters and this rule has to be applied with a little common sense.

Sallie Fahey stated that she did not see a difference between an RV and a boat and trailer.

Al Levy stated that the vehicles he started with are the problem ones and RV was added because the Committee requested it. He said that he does see a difference because an RV is self-propelled.

Sallie Fahey stated that an RV is also defined as a pop-up trailer.

Jay Seeger stated that is within our definition and it would simply need to be included.

Sallie Fahey asked that if they were allowing people to sell pop-up trailers, they should also be allowed to sell their boats and trailers.

Kathy Lind pointed out that a pop-up is not motorized.

Sallie Fahey stated that a trailer is not motorized either.

Al Levy pointed out that the definition stated "or an RV", therefore an RV is included whether it is motorized or not.

Sallie Fahey agreed. She stated that this definition should also allow for the sale of a boat and trailer.

Al Levy stated that he did not think a whole list should be created.

KD Benson agreed.

Al Levy stated that boats have not been a problem.

KD Benson stated that if boats become a problem, then it could be revisited.

Sallie Fahey stated that the reason for this proposal is to grant people the right to sell their vehicles.

Carl Griffin disagreed. He stated that the reason for this proposal is have the ability to say you don't have the right to do what you are doing. He said that even though we are creating a rule to allow certain things, it is being done in reaction to an abuse.

Jay Seeger explained that in the current situation, when an abuser is confronted, they could point the finger at everyone that is selling a car, even if the others are not abusing it. He said that issue then becomes one of selective enforcement.

Al Levy explained that what this proposal accomplishes is to legitimize it for the individual and at the same time invented a tool to use against the abusers.

Sallie Fahey asked if the motivation was to let an individual sell the family car.

Al Levy replied affirmatively.

Sallie Fahey asked if this was a permissive motivation and not an enforcement motivation.

Al Levy replied affirmatively.

Sallie Fahey stated that if the intent was to permit individuals to sell their family vehicles and RVs, shouldn't they also have the right to sell their boats and trailers.

Al Levy replied negatively. He said that would open a door and he did not want to start creating lists.

Sallie Fahey asked for clarification that if someone calls and asks if they can sell their boat or trailer, the staff has to answer no because the definition of family vehicle does not include them.

Al Levy replied affirmatively.

Robert Bowman stated that he was not sure he was clear on this whole proposal and he could see definite repercussions from it.

Al Levy pointed out that they are not taking any rights away from the citizens, they are giving more.

Gary Schroeder stated that the part he was unclear on was that even though it is illegal today, it can't be enforced because of everyone doing it.

Al Levy explained that if he has to write up an abuser, he also has to write up someone selling a family vehicle and he did not agree with that.

Sallie Fahey stated that the UZO does not really address what this is trying to correct. She pointed out that it would be difficult to classify someone who sold one car in 5 years as a car dealership.

Jay Seeger stated that when they first started this proposal, they tried to define a dealership, but it did not work for this purpose. He said that this proposal is the simplest way to address the problem.

Al Levy suggested that this proposal be sent to the full Plan Commission and if a problem arises, it can be revisited.

Carl Griffin moved to send the UZO amendment regarding the sale of family vehicles to the full Plan Commission, with the above-mentioned revisions of footnote number and placement included. Robert Bowman seconded and the motion carried by voice vote.

Sallie Fahey asked if this could be held until it could be included with another amendment in order to save on legal advertisement fees.

Al Levy stated that he did not have a problem with holding it. He said that the motion was to send it to the full Commission, but did not include a recommendation.

KD Benson stated that a recommendation to approve is implied because it was passed on to the full Plan Commission.

There were no objections to holding it until it could be combined with another amendment.

VI. PRIORITIES BETWEEN LOCAL ORDINANCES AND STATE LAW

Jay Seeger stated that the Commission has always operated on the basis that the UZO controls unless there is a stricter State Law or other stricter ordinance. He explained that the strictest rule applies whether it is from this office, the Health Department, the State or any other government office. He pointed out that this was never specifically stated anywhere. He said that this proposal would add one additional paragraph to the section on recognition of priorities. He recapped the proposal, which stated that the UZO does not supersede any more restrictive ordinance or requirements of any State or Federal law and when the UZO is permitted to be more restrictive, it would prevail.

KD Benson asked for the reason for this amendment.

Jay Seeger explained that when the question of "where does it say that" is raised, it could be easily pointed out. He reiterated that this is somewhat implied, but is mainly a housekeeping issue.

Carl Griffin asked if this was omitted from the meeting procedures that are read at each meeting.

Jay Seeger replied affirmatively. He gave some examples of flood victims who get contradictory responses from FEMA and us.

Carl Griffin moved to send the UZO amendment regarding Geographic Jurisdiction and Exclusion to the full Plan Commission, with a favorable recommendation, at a future date to be determined by the APC staff. Gary Schroeder seconded and the motion carried by voice vote.

VII. CITIZEN COMMENTS

David Buck stated that in the existing R1 zones the storm water detention systems were designed to handle a certain amount and by increasing it 5%, it would open the door to new patios and sheds. He explained that these things would more quickly concentrate the run off and fill up the storm facilities. He asked that the review committee also look at that issue.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Carl Griffin moved to adjourn the meeting. Gary Schroeder seconded the motion. KD Benson adjourned the meeting

Respectfully submitted,



Michelle D'Andrea
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Sallie Dell Fahey".

Sallie Dell Fahey
Executive Director